

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Vignia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| | · | | | | |
|---|-----------------|----------------------|-------------------------|------------------|--|
| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. | |
| 09/431,017 | 11/01/1999 | CLARE M. ANDERSON | DAVOX-164XX | 8138 | |
| 28452 | 7590 07/17/2003 | | | | |
| BOURQUE & ASSOCIATES, P.A. | | | EXAM | EXAMINER | |
| 835 HANOVER STREET SUITE 303 MANCHESTER, NH 03104 | | | NGUYEN, QUYNH H | | |
| | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER | |
| | | | ACTONII | FAFER NOMBER | |
| | | | 2642 | 9 | |
| | | | DATE MAILED: 07/17/2003 | | |
| | | | | | |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| 1. | Application No. | Applicant(s) | |
|--|--|---|--|
| Advisory Action | 09/431,017 | ANDERSON ET AL | |
| Advisory Action | Examiner | Art Unit | |
| | Quynh H Nguyen | 2642 | |
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appe | ars on the cover sheet with the c | orrespondence add | ress |
| THE REPLY FILED FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPI Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to average final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. |) a timely filed amendment which | ation. A proper reply n places the applica | ition in |
| PERIOD FOR RE | EPLY [check either a) or b)] | | |
| a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire leading ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the filed in the filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 Cere in the mailing based on the mailing and the mailing based on the mailing and the mailing based on the mailing based | divisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF The date on which the petition under 37 CFI extension and the corresponding amount the shortened statutory period for reply the later than three months after the mail | g date of the final rejecting FINAL REJECTION. R 1.136(a) and the approper the final the fee. The appropriginally set in the final | on. See MPEP opriate extension opriate extension Office action; or |
| 1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFF | | | |
| 2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be | ecause: | | |
| (a) they raise new issues that would require further | er consideration and/or search (s | see NOTE below); | |
| (b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note b | elow); | , | |
| (c) they are not deemed to place the application ir issues for appeal; and/or | n better form for appeal by mate | rially reducing or sir | mplifying the |
| (d) they present additional claims without cancelling NOTE: | ng a corresponding number of fi | nally rejected claim | s. |
| 3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject | ion(s): | | |
| 4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s). | be allowable if submitted in a se | eparate, timely filed | amendment |
| 5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for application in condition for allowance because: See | | dered but does NO | T place the |
| 6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becaraised by the Examiner in the final rejection. | ause it is not directed SOLELY t | o issues which were | e newly |
| 7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims we | | | and an |
| The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: | | | |
| Claim(s) allowed: None. | | | |
| Claim(s) objected to: | | | |
| Claim(s) rejected: <u>1,4-25 and 27-36</u> . | | | |
| Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: | | | |
| 8. The proposed drawing correction filed on is | a)☐ approved or b)☐ disapp | roved by the Exami | ner. |
| 9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statemer | nt(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s) | · • | |
| 10. Other: | | | |
| | | | |

Attachment: Examiner's Exhibit A



In the previous office action (paper # 5 dated 11/18/02), Examiner interpreted the "resources" as agents which can be grouped. Applicant then amended % claims 1, 5, 13, 25, and 33 (paper #6 dated 2/21/03) to recite "different resources". Then in the Final office action (paper #7 dated 4/24/03), Examiner interpreted the claimed "different resources" as:

- 1. queues (col. 1, lines 59-62)
- 2. agent workgroups and individual agents (col. 2, lines 5-8)
- 3. campaigns (col. 2, lines 8-11) and
- 4. call tables (col. 1, lines 63-65 system routing calls)

Furthermore, in the Final office action, Examiner makes assertions of facts being well known to those of ordinary skill in the art. For example:

- 1. For claim 1, inbound dialed number identification service (DNIS) is well known and defined in Newton's Telecom Dictionary, sixth Edition, August 1993, page 326 (attachment Examiner's Exhibit A).
- 2. For claim 6, adding user defined action detail data to the call center and including goals such as time spent talking to customers. This feature is well known and the advantages of using them are also well known. This feature is defined in class 379/265.07 and 379/265.08 (attachment Examiner's Exhibit A). The claimed invention recites the language "at least one..." and therefore only one is needed to be addressed.
- 3. For claims 34 and 35, display statistics manager is responsible to display resources in the call center is neccessary and obvious in a call center and there are many references that teach this. For example, Clare et al. (U.S. Patent 5,465,286) teach a system and method for supervising and automatic call distribution telephone system, wherein the prediction of pending abandonment of queued calls, pending loss of calls, and the potential financial impact of pending loss of calls are displayed (attachment Examiner's Exhibit A).

Examiner has found references that read on main claimed invention. However, it is unreasonable to include citations to prior references for <u>all</u> the "whistles and bells" that Applicant has in his claims.

Quynh H. Nguyen Tel: (703)-305-5451

AHMAD MATAR

SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600